

SLAVIŠA NEDELJKOVIĆ
University of Belgrade, Faculty of Philosophy
ned.slavisa@gmail.com

**BETWEEN THE IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT AND REBELS
(Old Serbia during the rebellion of the Shkodra Pasha Mustafa
Bushati and the Bosnian aristocracy 1830–1832)¹**

Abstract: One of the major problems which the Turkish central authorities had to cope with after 1826 was the issue of relations with great feudal lords who represented the holders of political and economic power in the inland parts of the empire. The problem was even more intensified when the Porte came into permanent conflict with the local government in the Rumelia pashalik wanting to abolish the old theocratic-military system and introduce a more modern and liberal regime. This conflict in the Muslim society was destroying the unity of the Turkish Islamic state and was one of the important factors in the further weakening of the Ottoman Empire. The fight with the Sultan and the Porte was first started by the Shkodra Pasha Mustafa and then by the Bosnian captain Husein Gradašćević. Both of these uprisings developed into a large military-political movement whose aim was to force the Sultan and Porte with armed force to suspend the reforms and to permit the return to old traditions and institutions stipulated by the Sharia.

Keywords: Old Serbia, reforms, Turkish government, Mustafa Pasha, Bosnian Beys, Ottoman Empire.

The first decades of the 19th century brought big problems to the Ottoman Empire. The Serbian uprisings in the Belgrade Pashalik, the rebellion of Ali Pasha of Tepelena, the rebellion of Eterists in Wallachia and Moldavia (1821), as well as the Greek Revolution (1821-1829) forced the central authorities in Constantinople to leave many important questions of internal politics of the Empire to local authorities, which were largely composed of old Turkish feudal families. The influence of the Porte in Rumelia was felt only in larger administrative centers, while all administrative authority in spacious eyalets and pashaliks in the European part of Turkey was in the hands of district pashas, derebeys, muhafizes and beys. The Porte thus lost effective control over the provincial rulers, which led to the strengthening of separatist movements that culminated in the rebellion of the Shkodra Mustafa Pasha Bushati and Bosnian feudal lords under the

¹ The paper was written as a phase result on the project Serbian nation – integrative and disintegrative processes (no. 177014) funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of Republic Serbia.

leadership of Captain Husein Gradašević.²

The social and economic position of the Serbian people in Turkey was closely related to the political situation of that time. As one of the most restless Turkish provinces, Old Serbia was an area in which the action of the central government was hardly felt. The weakening proof the power of the Ottoman Empire led to the strengthening of the position of the local pashas who became the only masters in certain areas of Old Serbia. The main feature of the unfavorable political situation in Old Serbia was anarchy. Public safety practically did not exist. The roads were controlled by bandit gangs so people could travel only with a strong armed escort of Turkish soldiers or with the protection of certain regional lords who controlled the roads which were located in their territory.³

The political history of Old Serbia at the beginning of the 19th century was reflected in mutual conflicts of local feudal lords wanting to expand their estates. These conflicts particularly culminated in mid 1820's, when in the territory of Old Serbia real small provincial wars were led between district feudal lords over who would dominate the vast areas of Old Serbia.⁴ These conflicts were particularly fierce in the central parts of Old Serbia: in the Peć, Vučitrn, Gnjilane and Mitrovica nahiyas. In the struggle to extend their estates as well as to gain political influence the most powerful feudal families fiercely fought each other.⁵ The battles that were fought in the Peć pashalik were especially prominent in their severity. The main participants in the conflict that began in 1826 were Shkodra Pasha Mustafa Bushatli and Numan Pasha from Peć. Wanting to annex the territory of the Peć pashalik to his land, Mustafa Pasha led his army to Peć in the spring of 1827 to break the resistance of Numan Pasha. Despite the fact that he possessed significant forces, Mustafa Pasha failed to take Peć so next year, in 1828, he organized a new campaign that turned into a real war, which drew in Turkish administrators, Arbanasi clans and Islamized Serbs. Shkodra Pasha drew to his side Mahmud Pasha Rotula from Prizren, the musellim of Gusinje, Gül bey, the musellim of Bijelo Polje Suleiman Aga Kučević and the Peshter zabit Husein Hot. The allies of the Peć pasha were the Kliments, the Rožajci, and a regional lord Yashar Pasha of Priština. The Russo-Turkish war that broke out in the spring of 1828 briefly interrupted this conflict but the fighting between the warring sides flared up again in the spring of 1829. As soon as he learned that Numan Pasha of Peć died, Bushatli mobilized his troops and attacked the Peć fortress under the excuse that he was gathering an army for the war against Russia for what he had permission from the Porte. This time, Mustafa Pasha Bushatli quickly broke the resistance of his opponents so the whole of Metohija fell under his rule.⁶

Armed conflicts between Turkish feudal lords also happened in other parts of Old Serbia. In the spring of 1826, a lord from Leskovac, Shashit Pasha, tried to put under his rule the area of Gornji Lab, but encountered strong resistance from the local Arbanasi.⁷ In the 1820's and 1830's, a true master of the Priština pashalik was Arbanasi Yashar Pasha of

² Popović 1996: 155-158.

³ Stojančević 1994b: 5-8.

⁴ Nedeljković 2012a: 18.

⁵ Stojančević, 1994a: 185-187; Vukanović 1969: 46-48.

⁶ Stojančević, 1971: 45-46.

⁷ AS, PO 1826, XII, No. 445, Filip Vuković to Prince Miloš Obrenović, Medveđa 19 July 1826.

Priština. Of a restless spirit and violent nature, Yashar Pasha brought real terror to the Serbian population in Kosovo. Using the weakness of the Turkish authorities in the area of Old Serbia, Yashar Pasha Džinić tore down churches, seized monastery estates, killed priests and in the course of several years “annihilated” 79 Serbian villages, 32 of which were in the Priština district, 22 in the Vučitrn nahiya and 25 in other parts of Kosovo.⁸ The residents of these villages were killed or banished and just as many Serbian village were forced to convert to Islam. The Pasha gave one part of the seized lands to Arbanasi and Islamized Serbs keeping other estates to himself.⁹ Yashar Pasha occasionally attacked both the Turks and the Arbanasi. Wanting to annex Vučitrn to his land, Yashar Pasha fought with Mahmud Bey, a powerful feudal lord from Vučitrn for a few years, who had support among the Novi Pazar Turks and the Arbanasi from Lab.¹⁰ Associated with the Arbanasi from Golak, the people from Lab did not recognize the authority of Yashar Pasha and repeatedly clashed with his troops.¹¹

In April 1828 the Russo-Turkish war broke out. Battles were fought in the Balkans and in Asia Minor. While the Russian army commanded by General Pashkevich was victorious in the east of Asia Minor, the Russian troops in the Balkans failed to break the resistance of modern Turkish nizam army. The turning point occurred in the summer of 1829, when the energetic and capable general Dibich managed to break the Turkish resistance and to penetrate to Jedren.¹² Enduring great pressure of the Russian army on the territory of the Danube Bulgaria, the Porte addressed Mustafa Pasha Bushatli, who was awarded the administration of Metohija, Ohrid, Debar and Elbasan in exchange for military engagement against the Russians.¹³ Having collected an army of 12,000 people, some of whom were Christians, Mustafa Pasha headed in the direction of western Bulgaria. On his way from Shkodra to Breznik, his troops were joined by the local pashas and ayans, so by the time they entered the Bulgarian soil his army had grown to about 20,000 people.¹⁴ Contrary to the old Turkish practice which implied that all the burden of accepting and feeding the army, as well as giving them a place to sleep, was the burden of the Christian population, the passage of this army through the eastern parts of Old Serbia happened without any major incidents. Mustafa Pasha strictly forbade his soldiers to rob and steal from Serbian peasants. He did not hesitate in the least to order the execution of the soldiers who committed a robbery, as was the case in the villages of Oraovica near Leskovac and Toplačko Polje near Vranje.¹⁵ This attitude of Mustafa Pasha Bushatli was in stark contrast with the attitude of Old Serbian pashas, who viewed the Serbian people in a different way. As soon as the news of the war with Russia came, in many parts of Old Serbia mass violence was committed against the local Serbian population. Under the pretext of looking for hidden

⁸ Mikić 1988: 17.

⁹ Bogdanović 1990: 160.

¹⁰ Stojančević 1971: 60-61.

¹¹ AS, MFO-F, 1840, f I, p. 90, PP No. 5849, Minister of Internal Affairs Đorđe Protić to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Belgrade, 19 January 1840.

¹² Ćorović 1993: 579.

¹³ Stojančević 1971: 46.

¹⁴ Hadži Vasiljević 1896: 328-329.

¹⁵ Trebješanin 1973: 27.

weapons, the Pirot ayan Bilal Aga and his soldiers robbed numerous Serbian villages at the same time committing the worst of crimes.¹⁶ A similar thing happened in Leskovac, where the Turks killed and plundered but also resorted to forced Islamization of the Serbian population.¹⁷ In the villages around Aleksinac and Paraćin the Arbanasi troops roamed the Serbian villages and publicly claimed that they would deal with the local Serbs and “that they would greatly hurt people”.¹⁸ Serbian villages that were located in the border zone with Serbia and the ones where the Turks stationed significant military forces particularly suffered in the Turkish raids. The fear of Turkish pashas from the border area that Serbia would not maintain a neutral stance in the Russo-Turkish conflict was best illustrated by the words of Mur Sajbija Pasha: “I thought that Prince Miloš was true to us, but he prepared an army of 80,000 to help Moscow, so as soon as Moscow crosses the Danube, he will immediately attack the Turks”.¹⁹

One of the major problems with which the Turkish central authorities had to cope after 1826 was the issue of relations with major feudal lords who represented the holders of political and economic power in the interior of the empire. The problem was even more intensified when the Porte wanted to abolish the old theocratic-military system and introduce a modern and liberal regime and thus came into permanent conflict with the local government in the Rumelia pashaliks. This was best seen in the summer of 1830, when in the territory between Monastir (Bitola) and Ioannina a large number of beys and ayans were dismissed. On that occasion about 270 of the most hardened opponents of the reforms were arrested, chained and taken to Constantinople.²⁰ This conflict within the Muslim society was destroying the unity of the Turkish-Islamic state and was one of the important factors in the further weakening of the Ottoman Empire.²¹ The quest of Mustafa Pasha Bushatli against the Russian army in Bulgaria did not go as well as the Porte expected. Poorly organized and trained, Bushatli’s army could not be compared with the Russian army, so already in the first big clash at Filipolje (present-day Plovdiv) they were completely shattered.²² After the defeat, Mustafa Pasha Bushatli retreated from the battlefield and, contrary to the orders from the Porte, he returned to Shkodra. Already at that time preparations started for the upcoming clash between the Shkodra Pasha and the central authorities in Constantinople.

In November 1830, the Porte sent a command to Mustafa Pasha through the Grand Vizier taking from him the administration of Metohija, Ohrid, Elbasan, Trgovište and Debra.²³ The loss of these vast areas represented a significant blow to the Shkodra Pasha both in political and in economic terms. At the time the Porte did not have high regard for

¹⁶ AS, PO, 1828, XII, No. 471, Mileta Radojković to Prince Miloš Obrenović, Jagodina, 12 March 1828; Id., NO. 371, Mileta Radojković to Prince Miloš Obrenović, Kragujevac 15 March 1828.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 1829, XII, No. 502, Mileta Radojković to Prince Miloš Obrenović, Jagodina, 14 February 1829.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 1828, XII, No. 486, Mileta Radojković to Prince Miloš Obrenović, Jagodina, 18 June 1828.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, XII, No. 473, Mileta Radojković to Prince Miloš Obrenović, Katun, 15 March 1828; *The Jagodina Nahiya, documents (1823-1830), vol. II*, ed. Zoran Marković and Ljubodrag Popović, Jagodina: Istorijski arhiv „Srednje Pomoravlje“, 2008, 130. *Pirot and the Nišava County 1801-1918, vol. I (1801-1883)*, collected and edited by Ilija Nikolić, Pirot: Muzej Ponišavlja, 1983, 24-25.

²⁰ AS, PO, XII, No. 541, Janać Radović to Prince Miloš Obrenović, Jagodina 21 August 1830.

²¹ Gavrilović 1912: 440-442; Stojančević 1999: 91-92.

²² Hadži Vasiljević 1896: 329.

²³ AS, PO, 1831, VII, No. 726, Prince Miloš Obrenović to Aleksa Simić, Kragujevac 20 January 1831.

the Shkodra Pasha. One of the main complaints referred to his participation in the Russo-Turkish war. Bushatli hired far fewer troops than the Porte requested and he did it with great delay and when it was clear that the Russians won the war. Although in 1829 Bushatli had 25,000 troops under his command, 6,000 of which were his personal guard, in the conflicts against the Russians he engaged significantly fewer people, mostly tribal and bashi-bazouk units.²⁴ Furthermore, Bushatli's connections with Prince Miloš, the Russians and the Bosnian opposition only strengthened the negative opinion about him on the Turkish court. Finally, at that time the Porte began to question the legitimacy of Bushatli's authority over the Shkodra pashalik. As Mustafa Pasha took the position of the administrator of the Shkodra pashalik (after the death of his uncle Ibrahim Pasha, a former Rumeli wali and the commander of the Turkish forces in the battle of Deligrad of 1809) skipping the legitimate successor, Ibrahim Pasha's son Mustafa, Constantinople started viewing Bushatli as the usurper.²⁵

Bearing all this in mind, Mustafa Pasha Bushatli decided that at the beginning of 1831 he would definitely break ties with the Porte. At the gathering of tribal chiefs and the ulema in Shkodra, which was held on 4 January 1831, it was decided that new measures were contrary to Islam and Sharia and that they did not oblige anyone. The Arbanasi present at the meeting took the oath (*besa*) to forcefully oppose the Turkish authorities if they attempted to implement the reform in practice.²⁶ In a special buyuruldi (announcement) Mustafa Pasha invited all Muslims to go on a campaign to Constantinople to overthrow the Sultan, who was publically claimed to be not a Turk but a Christian by the opponents of the reform.²⁷ When Sultan Mahmud II destroyed the Janissaries (1826) and wanted to modernize the empire and end the political and feudal anarchy, there was a general rebellion among the Muslim population of Old Serbia, Albania and Bosnia. The new measures included creating a regular army and compulsory military service, introducing new taxes and their regular collection, the abolition of privileges, improving the position of the Christian population, all of which caused a great resistance of the Muslim population. Dissatisfied Muslims found the abolition of the Sharia law and the improvement of the position of the Christian population particularly unacceptable.²⁸

Under the strong influence of religious ideology, the Sharia law and Islamic religious circles, for a long period of time the socio-political consciousness of the Muslim population in Turkey suffered almost no changes in the attitude towards the position of the Christian population of the Ottoman Empire. Turkish state institutions in the judiciary, economy and administration enabled the dominant position of Muslims against Christians, which was a guarantee of the denominational class structure of the Ottoman Empire. The ideological basis of all of that was the Sharia legislation with the assistance of its legal instruments, keeping the subordinate Christian population in such a position that they were not allowed any kind of national, political, economic and cultural emancipation.²⁹ The religious teaching

²⁴ AS, PO, 1831, VII, No. 726, Prince Miloš Obrenović to Aleksa Simić, Kragujevac 20 January 1830.

²⁵ Gavrilović 1912: 330; Stojančević 1971: 49.

²⁶ Beriša 1973: 146-14.

²⁷ Milić 1983: 273.

²⁸ Hadži Vasiljević 1905: 35-36.

²⁹ Stojančević 1991: 23-24.

of Islam and the Sharia law clearly defined the position of the non-Muslim population as second-class citizens who did not have the right to influence social, political and economic conditions in the Ottoman Empire. Everything concerning political life and state organization was exclusively the privilege of Muslims. That is why every public appearance to improve the social and agrarian-legal position of Christians, even if it was only formal, was perceived as a threat to Islam and as such encountered resistance from many layers of the Muslim society. Besides being directed at preserving the old privileges and Islamic Sharia law, the fight against the reforms also represented an attempt to prevent subordinate Christians to use these reforms.³⁰

Using the argument of the defense of Sharia law, regardless of how much he really was a true follower of the Koran, Mustafa Pasha gathered around him a growing number of disgruntled feudal lords from neighboring pashaliks in Arbania and Old Serbia. The struggle for the defense of true Islamic values was a great occasion for the gathering of all those who saw reforms as the danger for preserving their positions and privileges. Since all other pashas gradually joined the Porte reforms, Mustafa Pasha did not find it difficult to surround himself with a growing number of supporters.³¹ Wanting to create a wide front against the central Turkish authorities, Bushatli agitated for his cause in Bosnia, offering a joint struggle against the reform actions of Sultan Mahmud II. Mustafa Pasha Bushatli won over the lords of the Elbasan, Prizren, Đakovo, Peć, Priština, Skopje, Vranje and Leskovac pashaliks, many Arbanasi lords, the Tetovo ayan and the lord of Breznica master Ali Bey Karafejzić.³² Shortly after the publication of the manifesto against the sultan, the supporters of the Shkodra Pasha went into action. Already in mid-January all the representatives of local authorities appointed by the Porte half a year before with the help of the army were banished from Elbasan, Bitola and Debra. At the same time, local feudal lords started gathering their troops to join the Shkodra Pasha in his crusade against the Sultan and the Porte.³³ In mid-March 1831 the rebel army led by Mustafa Pasha Bushatli went from Shkodra through Prizren and in late March arrived in Skoplje. Bushatli was welcome there by many supporters who had arrived to that town from numerous sanjaks of Arbania, Old Serbia and Macedonia. The arrival of Bushatli's army in Skopje put the Skopje administrator Hivzi Pasha in a very awkward position. Loyal to the imperial authorities, Hivzi Pasha did not dare to directly confront Mustafa Pasha, whose army invaded the Skoplje pashalik. Although he was known as a tolerant pasha who protected Christians and who knew how to deal with tyrants and plundering armies, Hivzi Pasha had to be reserved when Bushatli's troops started looting the surrounding Serbian villages immediately upon arrival in Skoplje.³⁴

Bushatli's armed forces numbering up to 40,000 people managed in a short time to undermine the authority of the Sultan in almost the entire western Rumelia. His followers placed under their control a large territory bordered by the line Sofia-Samokov-Dupnitsa-

³⁰ Nedeljković 20146: 1350-1352.

³¹ Džambazovski 1979: 70-71.

³² Gavrilović 1912: 334; Stojančević 1971: 49-50.

³³ AS, PO, XII, No. 582, Jagodina 1 February 1831, Džambazovski 1979: 75.

³⁴ Hadži Vasiljević 1930: 477-478.

Kyustendil-Veles-Debar, including these cities.³⁵ Although the territory held by Bushatli's supporters was large, poor organization and problematic loyalty of some of the Turkish and Arbanasi pashas, some of whom secretly maintained ties with the Porte, did not represent the realistic situation on the field. Despite the great success that came at the very beginning, the separatist and anti-reformational movement of Mustafa Pasha Bushatli did not last long. Although the army of the Shkodra Pasha was numerous, its combat power was not at a high level. Gathered from various places, the troops had bad discipline and organization and were also very poorly armed. Therefore, in a conflict with a small but well-organized nizam army led by Mustafa Reshid Pasha, they suffered a complete defeat. Part of the responsibility for that definitely belonged to Mustafa Pasha Bushatli, who was completely convinced of his superiority over the imperial troops. Instead of striking Reshid Pasha with his whole army, he divided it into two wings, directing one to Sofia and the other to Veles, thus significantly weakening the combat power of his army.³⁶ The command of the rebel troops who went to Sofia was entrusted to Ali Bey Karafejzić. He was the son of the famous Kardzali leader Karafejzija who imposed his government in Breznik, Znepolje and Trn. The violent rule of Karafejzija and his son was marked by terror and numerous abuses committed against the local Christian population.³⁷ On his way to Sofia, Karafejzić stayed in Priština for a short time, where he was joined by mercenary troops. Each Arbanasi who participated in the raid against the imperial troops as a rider was paid 150 and each footman 100 Turkish piasters per month.³⁸ Wanting to win over the Turks and the Arbanasi in the Aleksinac, Ražanj and Paraćin counties, Karafejzić sent his captain Dabli Mustafa to these regions with a task to use gifts and money to recruit the local Muslim champions. Karafejzić contacted the Kruševac zabit Seyyid Mence and his brother Miftar, who promised him that they would support the Shkodra Pasha and that they would send 1,000 people.³⁹ Since he did not have great confidence in the Turks from Niš and Leskovac, Karafejzić ruthlessly threatened the local pashas that their every contact with the imperial authorities would be severely punished. To make sure that the Turks from Niš would not deceive him, Karafejzić made the local pasha let 600 Arbanasi into the fortress and entrust the command of the garrison to Mahmud Pasha's aide, the Niš ayan Haji Ali.⁴⁰ All of this made the Leskovac lord Ibrahim Pasha send 1,000 horsemen to help Mustafa Pasha as a sign of loyalty and alliance.⁴¹ As they did not encounter stronger forces of the imperial army, the troops of the Shkodra Pasha conquered Sofia without any major problems. After Sofia, Bushatli's army plundered almost entire the Sofia sanjak. In this way Krafejzić wanted to take revenge on the Sofia bishop and the local Christian serfs because they had helped the Sofia musellim Çelebi-aga

³⁵ Stojančević 1971: 49-50.

³⁶ Beriša 1973: 147.

³⁷ Stojančević 1971: 40.

³⁸ AS, PO, XII, No. 599, Mileta Radojković to Prince Miloš Obrenović, Jasika 8 May 1831.

³⁹ *Ibid*, XII, No. 646, Arandel Milosavljević to Prince Miloš Obrenović, Jagodina 27 August 1831; Marković, Mišković 2010: 120-124.

⁴⁰ AS, PO, 1831, XII, No. 596, Janać Radaović to Prince Miloš Obrenović, Jagodina 1 May 1831; *Ibid*, XII, No. 600, Janać Radaović to Prince Miloš Obrenović, Jagodina 10 May 1831.

⁴¹ Trebješanin 1973: 27.

escape.⁴²

In Istanbul it was clear that the implementation of political and economic reforms in the country depended on breaking the separatist movements in Arbania and Bosnia. Therefore, the command of the army was given to the Grand Vizier Mehmed Reshid Pasha. In a surprise attack the Turkish army smashed Bushatli's forces in Florina and then took Bitola where they caught and killed most of the champions of southern Arbania.⁴³ The Turkish army then continued to advance and very soon and without much resistance they conquered Debar, Elbasan, Durrës, Tirana and Kavaja. To prevent the further progression of the imperial army, supported by the majority of the Kosovo pashas Mustafa Pasha and his troops headed in the direction of Bitola. Having received the news about the movement of Bushatli's army, the Grand Vizier left Ioannina and with his troops quickly moved to meet the rebels.⁴⁴ At the same time the Jedren Pasha and his nizam troops headed in the direction of Sofia to confront with Bushatli's army, which was located in western Bulgaria.⁴⁵ The decisive battle between the imperial troops composed of nizams and mercenary troops of Toskas and Bushatli's army took place on 21 April in the mountain gorges of Babune near Prilep. The battle ended with the victory of the imperial army, which was so convincing that Mustafa Pasha himself barely escaped the battlefield with the remnants of his army. In this battle the army of the Shkodra Pasha had several thousand dead and wounded and over 14,000 captured fighters. After the defeat Mustafa Pasha arrived in Prizren via Skoplje with only a hundred people and unsuccessfully tried to create a new army. Afterwards, Mustafa Pasha retired in Shkodra, where he endured six months of siege by the Turkish army.⁴⁶ The Skoplje lord Hivzi Pasha played a huge role in breaking Bushatli's army at the battle of Babušhan, because at a key moment he left the battlefield without fighting, which helped the nizams and Toskas to easily break the main part of the rebel forces who were personally commanded by Mustafa Pasha.⁴⁷ After the arrival of the imperial army in Skoplje, Hivzi Pasha returned to this city and again established his rule over this pashalik. This behavior of Hivzi Pasha was not approved by the majority of the Muslim population in the Skoplje pashalik, which was especially evident in the anti-reform movements that occurred in the early 1840's.⁴⁸ Simultaneously with the offensive in Old Serbia, the imperial army continued advancing towards western Bulgaria. Nizam units initially suppressed Karafejzić's troops near Plovdiv and then completely shattered them on the road to Sofia.⁴⁹

After the occupation of Skoplje, the troops of the imperial army came to Kosovo, from where they continued with further actions against the Kosovo and Metohija pashas. Facing the retaliation of the imperial army and being left to themselves, the Arbanasi feudal lords anxiously awaited further steps of the imperial authorities. There were two choices before the grand vizier Mehmed Reshid Pasha: the first implied a harsh reckoning with the

⁴² Gavrilović 1912: 342-345.

⁴³ AS, PO, XII, No. 603, Mileta Radojković to Prince Miloš Obrenović, Katun 22 May 1831.

⁴⁴ Beriša 1973: 148.

⁴⁵ AS, PO, XII, No. 646, Arandel Milosavljević to Prince Miloš Obrenović, Jagodina 27 August 1832.

⁴⁶ Beriša 1973: 148.

⁴⁷ Stojančević 1971: 50-51.

⁴⁸ Nedeljković 2014a: 249-251.

⁴⁹ AS, PO, XII, No. 646, Arandel Milosavljević to Prince Miloš Obrenović, Jagodina 27 August 1832.

rebellious pashas of Kosovo-Metohija, and the second relied on mild pacification of Kosovo and the surrounding areas. Not wanting to use punitive measures against the vanquished Arbanasi pashas, which would have increased the resistance of the Bosnian aristocracy even more and thereby extend their uprising, Mehmed Reshid Pasha opted for the second choice. Of all the rebels, Yashar Pasha of Priština was amnestied first and he was given back his estates and the position he had in the Priština pashalik under the condition to never rebel against the imperial authorities again. The situation was similar with Rezak Pasha of Peć, Seyfudin Pasha from Đakovica and the powerful family Rotul from Prizren. By the beginning of summer these pashas and their troops joined the army of the Grand Vizier, who was in Kosovo and was preparing for a clash with the army of the Bosnian aristocracy led by Captain Husein Gradašćević, nicknamed “Dragon of Bosnia”.⁵⁰ After the collapse in Prilep, the anti-reform movement of the Shkodra Pasha was abandoned by the pashas of Niš, Leskovac and Vranje. Ibrahim Pasha of Leskovac and his brother Mehmed rushed to help the Turks from Niš to regain control of the city. The Arbanasi garrison was banished from Niš and all major supporters of Bushatli were caught and killed. In the conflict with the Sultan’s opposition in Niš Christian prince Živko was also killed. The Porte appointed Mahmud-Bey of Leskovac the new Pasha of Niš and the muhafiz of the Niš fortress, ordering him to defend Niš from the army of Ali Bey Karafejzić together with Ibrahim Pasha.⁵¹ All this caused a swift reaction of Ali Bey Karafejzić, who was located in Kuršumlilija with an army of 10,000 people.⁵² Karafejzić wanted to somewhat strengthen the position of Shkodra by taking Niš and save his movement from complete collapse. However, it soon became obvious that all this would amount to nothing. The defeat at Prilep and the escape of Mustafa Pasha Bushatli was fatal for the morale of Karafejzić’s army. This was best illustrated by the “battles” led with the army of Ibrahim Pasha near the city of Korvin and Orljani, which resembled more a peacetime maneuver than a clash of armed military formations. After that, Karafejzić went deeper into Kosovo through Prokuplje and Kuršumlilija.⁵³ Although he caused a lot of problems for the imperial authorities, the Porte was very benign towards him. After crushing Bushatli’s rebellion and taking over Shkodra, Ali Bey Karafejzić initially received amnesty for his participation in the rebellion, and then he got a position in the Turkish army.⁵⁴

At the same time when the unrest started in the pashaliks of Old Serbia and Arbania, there was a conflict between the central authorities and the Bosnian aristocracy. Although this movement emerged from the general reasons that led to the uprising against the Porte, it also had its special causes which were a consequence of the specificity of the organization of the Turkish authorities in Bosnia. Unlike Old Serbia and northern Arbania, where the continuity of Turkish feudalism was secured by favoring a small number of Arbanasi in the service of the Turkish authorities, Bosnian feudalism was in full force. Embodied in about 40 captaincies (which represented the military-political administration of certain kadiluks, districts), which were run by hereditary captains, the feudal system in Bosnia had solid

⁵⁰ Stojančević 1999: 90-92.

⁵¹ Trebješanin 1973: 28; Stojančević 1996: 258-261.

⁵² AS, PO, XII, No. 613, Stevan Nedeljčević to Prince Miloš Obrenović, Jagodina 16 August 1831.

⁵³ Marković, Mišković 2010: 59-60.

⁵⁴ AS, PO, XII, No. 646, Arandel Milosavljević to Prince Miloš Obrenović, Jagodina 27 August 1831.

foundations. The numerous and economically strong feudal class in Bosnia gained a lot in political importance over time through a special military-political organization. For that reason the reform actions of sultans Selim III and Mahmud II, implemented in order to strengthen and modernize the Empire encountered very strong resistance in Bosnia.⁵⁵ The destruction of the Janissaries order that occurred in 1826, by the intensity of the force used, was the fiercest in Bosnia right after Constantinople, which only increased the gap between the Bosnian feudal oligarchy and the Porte. During the Russo-Turkish War of 1828-29, the Bosnian Muslims poorly responded to the call of Sultan to go to war against Russia. The recruitment did not go as the Porte planned and the majority of the Bosnian Muslims remained in their towns and villages. After the war, the Porte tried to impose order and restore its authority in the Bosnian pashalik. The newly appointed Bosnian vizier, Ali Namik-Pasha was given the task to make a list of military obligees for the Turkish regular army and was told, if need be, to introduce the Nizam-I Djedid in Bosnia.⁵⁶ This attitude of the Porte was met with a harsh response from the Bosnian aristocracy in the territory of the whole pashalik. This was best seen in May 1830, when a very small number of people responded to the call of Ali Namik Pasha sent to the captains and district pashas to come to Travnik in order to agree on the implementation of the reforms. All this clearly indicated that the Porte government was hardly felt in this traditionally restless Turkish province which was sinking deeper and deeper into revolt and anarchy. The assembly in Travnik held in late March 1831 led to the final separation between the central government and the Bosnian beys, which soon turned into an open armed conflict between the Sultan's supporters and opponents. As the main opponents of the imperial authorities and bearers of the movement against the reforms, the following were very prominent: Mahmud Pasha of Zvornik, Mehmed bey of Tuzla, captain Husein Gradašćević, Memish bey of Sarajevo, Osman bey of Mostar and Mustafa Ćinić Aga from Sarajevo.⁵⁷

The movement of Husein Gradašćević was aimed at preserving the old bey-captains' rights and privileges and advocated the expansion of administrative power and greater independence from the central government. Seeing the rebel beys as natural allies, in April 1831 Mustafa Pasha sent his aide to Travnik in order to make an alliance on the joint action against the Porte. Although the two sides did not make a formal alliance, the Bosnian beys promised to the Shkodra Pasha to support him and to soon send him 10,000 people.⁵⁸ However, despite the willingness of the Shkodra Pasha, the alliance with Gradašćević lasted a very short time. As soon as the news spread about the defeat of Mustafa Pasha near Prilep and his withdrawal to Shkodra, there was a termination of cooperation. Realizing that the defeat of the Shkodra Pasha threatened the further development of the situation, captain Husein Gradašćević decided to defend the achievements of the Bosnian uprising in the Raška area and Kosovo. Already in mid-May, the first contingents of the Bosnian army under the command of the Sarajevo musellim Gül Ağa and the ayan from Srebrenica Memish bey arrived to Novi Pazar. They first appointed the new authorities in Novi Pazar

⁵⁵ Stojančević, Milićević, Popov, Jovanović, Ekmečić 1981: 229-231; Stojančević 1971: 52.

⁵⁶ Gavrilović 1912: 334; Stojančević 1996: 258-260.

⁵⁷ Stojančević 1971: 52-53.

⁵⁸ Stojančević 1971: 56.

and then started to organize a line of defense against the army of Mehmed Reshid Pasha. Gradašćević seriously prepared to confront the imperial army whose main forces were still at Shkodra. The plan of the Bosnian rebels was to concentrate around Novi Pazar and Sjenica and then to enter Kosovo more deeply in order to force the army of the Grand Vizier to a decisive battle.⁵⁹ This decisive battle between the imperial troops, i.e. its satellite divisions, and the Bosnian beys occurred on 16 July 1831 near Lipljani. Wishing to surround a wing of the imperial troops, a few days earlier Gradašćević had deployed about 5,000 soldiers in the area of Kačanik. Not knowing anything about it, the vanguard of the imperial army commanded by Ćor Ibrahim Pasha walked right into Gradašćević's trap and came under attack of the Bosnian army which was several times superior. In a fierce battle the Bosnian feudal lords completely defeated the Turkish troops. Ćor Ibrahim Pasha died in this battle as well as a large number of nizams, while Hivzi Pasha of Skopje, Abdul Rezak Pasha of Peć and the miralay of the imperial cavalry Mehmed bey were wounded and retreated to Skopje. The victory of the Bosnian feudal near Lipljani was triumphant. In addition to a large number of the nizams who were killed, about 2,000 soldiers were detained and brought to Priština. Besides that, seven cannons and a large quantity of small arms and military equipment were seized.⁶⁰

After the victory near Lipljani, Gradašćević's movement was joined by the pashas of Leskovac and Vranje and a number of Arbanasi pashas in Kosovo. Ismail Pasha of Leskovac saw the movement of the Bosnian bey as an opportunity to keep his pashalik and to annul the Sultan's decree of 1830, which stipulated that the northern parts of the Kruševac pashalik (which administratively belonged to Leskovac) were given to Serbia. However, the alliance between the treacherous Ismail Pasha and captain Husein Gradašćević did not last long. In the spring of 1832, as soon as he realized that the uprising of Bosnian feudal lords was on the verge of collapse, like in the case of the rebellion of Shkodra Pasha, Ismail Pasha switched sides and joined the Sultan's camp.⁶¹ After the defeat at Lipljani the imperial army left the central parts of Kosovo and Metohija, and ceded this territory to the Bosnian rebels. Negotiations soon started and the Grand Vizier accepted most of the demands of the Bosnian rebels in the name of the Sultan. On that occasion, Mehmed Reshid Pasha agreed to the demand of the Bosnians that the Porte recognized Husein Gradašćević as the vizier of Bosnia in a special decree. It is interesting that in these negotiations there was no talk of Mustafa Pasha Bushatli, so he had to continue to repel the attacks of the imperial army around Shkodra.⁶² After the negotiations with the Grand Vizier ended, the Bosnians left Kosovo and Metohija, which suited the Porte and allowed it to re-organize its administration in these areas. Although there were rumors that some pashas had contact with the Bosnian lords, the Porte refrained from the use of repressive measures believing that at that moment the elimination of the Shkodra Pasha was their main military objective.⁶³ In late October 1831 the army of Grand Vizier Mehmed Reshid Pasha managed to take Shkodra and trapped Mustafa Pasha Bushatli. After this success, the next step of the central Turkish authorities

⁵⁹ Gavrilović 1912: 356-358.

⁶⁰ Stojančević 1971: 57.

⁶¹ Trebješanin 1973: 28.

⁶² Stojančević 1971: 57-59.

⁶³ Nedeljković 2012, 260-162; Gavrilović 1912: 351-378.

was crushing the rebellion of the Bosnian rulers and forcing them into submission.⁶⁴

In the preparation for a military campaign against Husein Gradašćević, the Porte appointed Kara Mahmud Pasha as the new Bosnian vizier and put under his command imperial nizams and Arbanasi troops from Kosovo and Metohija. At the same time, the Porte appointed Ali Namik Pasha, a former Bosnian vizier, as the new Shkodra vizier and Ali Bey Rizvanbegović as the Herzegovinian Pasha. During the campaign against the Bosnian beys Yashar Pasha of Priština, Ibrahim Pasha of Peć and the Prizren lord Mahmud Pasha played an important role. This was especially seen in February 1832 when a unit of Bosnians under the command of captain Krupa made a sudden breakthrough in Kosovo and took Vučitrn and Gnjilan, from where they were quickly banished by Yashar Pasha of Priština.⁶⁵ It was also the first defeat of the Bosnian bey and these defeats would continue until the final collapse. The pashas of Old Serbia played an important role in the battle of Prijepolje (May 1832) when their troops shattered Bosnian troops, thus enabling the imperial army to win.⁶⁶ Contrary to expectation, the intervention of the imperial army against Husein Gradašćević was short and lasted only a few months. The main battle happened in Pale on 17 May 1832 and ended in the utter defeat of Gradašćević's army. The most deserving in this fight was the Herzegovinian Pasha Ali Bey Rizvanbegović, who suddenly appeared on the battlefield and attacked the bulk of the Bosnian army from the side. The troops of Arslan Pasha of Peć also participated in this battle and suffered great loss in a clash with the Bosnian forces under the command of Ali Pasha Vidajić.⁶⁷ After the defeat in Pale, Sarajevo surrendered without a fight and in early June Gradašćević and his closest associates left Bosnia and went to Austria.⁶⁸ Providing a political asylum to the refugees from the Ottoman Empire was a positive tradition of the policy of the Habsburg Monarchy in the Balkans. Austrian authorities accepted the leaders of the Bosnian aristocracy from the anti-reform movement and provided them a political asylum. The Austrian government even intervened in the Porte so Gradašćević and his followers could receive political amnesty. Gradašćević was pardoned, but he was not allowed to return to Bosnia. He died of tuberculosis in Constantinople in 1833.⁶⁹

After the suppression of the uprising, the Porte began to introduce the new administration in Bosnia that was conciliatory towards both the local feudal lords and the Christian population. The situation was similar in Old Serbia, where the grand vizier Mahmud Reshid Pasha (who stayed in Priština and Vučitrn from May to June 1832) introduced "many useful decrees". These regulations, among other things, regulated some very important questions. The "Grand veziers regulations" regulated the issue of forced labor, while the presence of Turks in Christian villages was prohibited. On this occasion, many claimants in the Priština pashalik got back their confiscated properties. It was of great importance for the troubled Serb population in Kosovo and Metohija, who went through a true demographic and financial disaster in the period from 1829 to 1832. The period of

⁶⁴ Popović 1996: 161.

⁶⁵ Beriša 1973: 148.

⁶⁶ Nedeljković 2012b: 261.

⁶⁷ AS, PO, XII, No. 673, Mita Tirić to Prince Miloš Obrenović, Nova Varoš 24 May 1832.

⁶⁸ Stojančević 1971: 66-68.

⁶⁹ Ćorović 1993: 583.

relative peace in the area of Old Serbia did not last long. The new Arbanasi movements that began in the early months of 1834 continued until 1836 and again made Old Serbia one of the most restless Rumelian provinces of the Ottoman Empire.⁷⁰

REFERENCES:

Source and material:

Archive of Serbia (AS)

Prince's Office (PO)

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Foreign Department (MFO-F)

Material for the History of the Macedonian People from the Archive of Serbia, vol. I, issue I (1820-1848), ed. Kliment Džambazovski, Belgrade: Arhiv Srbije 1979. [Грађа за историју македонског народа из Архива Србије, том I, књига I (1820-1848), приредио Климент Џамбазовски, Београд: Архив Србије 1979.]

Pirot and the Nišava County 1801-1918, vol. I (1801-1883), collected and edited by Ilija Nikolić, Pirot: Muzej Ponišavlja, 1983. [Пирот и Нишавски срез 1801-1918, књига I (1801-1883), сабрао и приредио Илија Николић, Пирот: Музеј Понишавља, 1983.]

The Jagodina Nahiya, documents (1823-1830), vol. II, ed. Zoran Marković and Ljubodrag Popović, Jagodina: Istorijски архив „Srednje Pomoravlje“, 2008. [Јагодинска нахија, документи (1823-1830), књига II, приредили Зоран Марковић и Љубодраг Поповић, Јагодина: Историјски архив „Средње Поморавље“, 2008.]

The Jagodina Nahiya, documents (1830-1835), vol. III, ed. Zoran Marković and Svetlana Mišković, Jagodina: Istorijски архив „Srednje Pomoravlje“, 2010. [Јагодинска нахија, документи (1830-1835), књига III, приредили Зоран Марковић и Светлана Мишковић, Јагодина: Историјски архив „Средње Поморавље“, 2010.]

References:

Beriša, A. *Kosovo nekad i sad*, Beograd: Ekonomska politika, 1973. [Бериша, А. *Косово некад и сад*, Београд: Економска политика, 1973.]

Bogdanović, D. *Knjiga o Kosovu*, Beograd: Srpska književna zadruga, 1990 [Богдановић, Д. *Књига о Косову*, Београд: Српска Књижевна задруга, 1990.]

Ćorović, V. *Istorija Srba*, Beograd: BIGZ, 1993. [Ћоровић, В. *Историја Срба*, Београд: БИГЗ, 1993.]

Gavrilović, M. *Miloš Obrenović, III knjiga (1827-1835)*, Beograd: Štamparija „Davidović“, 1912. [Гавриловић, М. *Милош Обреновић, III књига (1827-1835)*, Београд: Штампарија „Давидовић“, 1912.]

Mikić, Đ. *Društvene i ekonomske prilike kosovskih Srba u XIX i početkom XX veka (od čifčijstva do bankarstva)*, Beograd: srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, 1988. [Микић, Ђ. *Друштвене и економске прилике косовских Срба у XIX и почетком XX века (од чифчијства до банкарства)*, Београд: Српска академија наука и уметности, 1988.]

Milić, D. *Istorija Niša od najstarijih vremena do oslobođenja od Turaka 1878, I knjiga*, Niš: Prosveta, 1983. [Милић, Д. *Историја Ниша од најстаријих времена до ослобођења од Турака 1878. године, I књига*, Ниш: Просвета, 1983.]

Nedeljković, S. *Srbija i Kosovo i Metohija (1856-1897), kulturno-prosvetni i nacionalni rad*, Niš:

⁷⁰ Недељковић 20126: 261-262; Микић 1988: 18-19, 90-91.

- Filozofski fakultet, 2012a. [Недељковић, С. *Србија и Косово и Метохија (1856-1897), културно-просветни и национални рад*, Ниш: Филозофски факултет, 2012.]
- _____. „Srpski narod na Kosovu i Metohiji od grčkog ustanka do proglašenja Hatišerifaod Gilhane (1821-1839)“, *Srpske studije*, 3, 2012b, 255-277. [Недељковић, С. „Српски народ на Косову и Метохији од грчког устанка до проглашења Хатишерифа од Гилхане (1821-1839)“, *Српске студије*, 3, 2012, 255-277.]
- _____. „Ustanak Arbanasa protiv turskih vlasti u Skopskom i Kosovskom pašaluku 1844. godine (robuna Derviš cara)“, *Istraživanja*, 25, 2014a, 249-260. [Недељковић, С. „Устанак Арбанаса против турских власти у Скопском и Косовском пашалуку 1844. године (побуна Дервиш цара)“, *Истраживања*, 25, 2014, 249-260.]
- _____. „Društveni i agrarno-pravni položaj srpskog naroda u Niškom pašaluku u prvim decenijama 19. veka“, *Теме*, 3, 2014b, 1349-1363. [Недељковић, С. „Друштвени и аграрно-правни положај српског народа у Нишком пашалуку у првим деценијама 19. века“, *Теме*, 3, 2014, 1349-1363.]
- Popović, V. *Istočno pitanje, itorijski pregled borbe oko opstanka osmanlijske carevine u Levantu i na Balkanu*, Beograd: Službeni list SRJ, 1996. [Поповић, Васиљ, *Источно питање, историјски преглед борбе око опстанка османлијске царевине у Леванту и на Балкану*, Београд: Службени лист СРЈ, 1996.]
- Stojančević, V. *Južnoslovenski narodi u Osmanskom carstvu od Jedrenskog mira 1829. godine do Pariskog kongresa 1856. godine*, Beograd: Izdavačko-štamarsko preduzeće РТТ, 1971. [Стојанчевић, В. *Јужнословенски народи у Османском царству од Једренског мира 1829. године до Париског конгреса 1856. године*, Београд: Издавачко-штампарско предузеће РТТ, 1971.]
- _____. *Ustanak 1841. godine u Jugoistočnoj Srbiji*, Leskovac: Narodni muzej, 1991. [Стојанчевић, В. *Устанак 1841. године у Југоисточној Србији*. Лесковац: Народни музеј, 1991.]
- _____. *Srbi i Arbanasi 1804-1912*, Novi Sad: Prometej, 1994a. [Стојанчевић, В. *Срби и Арбанаси 1804-1912*, Нови Сад: Прометеј, 1994.]
- _____. *Kosovo i Metohija u srpsko-arbanaškim odnosima u XIX veku (1804-1878)*, Beograd: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, 1994b. [Стојанчевић, В. *Косово и Метохија у српско-арбанашким односима у XIX веку (1804-1878)*, Београд: Српска академија наука и уметности, 1994.]
- _____. *Jugoistočna Srbija u XIX veku (1804-1878)*, Niš: Prosveta, 1996. [Стојанчевић, В. *Југоисточна Србија у XIX веку (1804-1878)*, Ниш: Просвета, 1996.]
- _____. „Историјски преглед прогона и нестајања Срба у Метохији и на Косову за време турске управе (до 1912)“, *Dobrovoljački glasnik*, 13, 1999, 90-98. [Стојанчевић, В. „Историјски преглед прогона и нестајања Срба у Метохији и на Косову за време турске управе (до 1912)“, *Добровољачки гласник*, 13, 1999, 90-98.]
- Stojančević, V. Miličević, J. Popov, Č. Jovanović, R. Ekmečić, M. *Istorija srpskog naroda, knjiga V-1*, Beograd: Srpska književna zadruga, 1981. [Стојанчевић, В. Милићевић, Ј. Попов, Ч. Јовановић, Р. Екмечић, М. *Историја српског народа, књига V-1*, Београд: Српска књижевна задруга, 1981.]
- Trebješanin, R. „Leskovački kadiluk od 1830. do 1842. godine“, *Leskovački zbornik*, XIII, 1973, 23-40. [Требјешанин, Р. „Лесковачки кадилук од 1830. до 1842. године“, *Лесковачки зборник*, XIII, 1973, 23-40.]
- Vasiljević, H. J. „Ka istoriji grada Vranja“, *Godišnjica Nikole Čupića*, XVI, 1996, 265-338. [Васиљевић, Х. Ј. „Ка историји града Врања“, *Годишњица Николе Чупића*, XVI, 1996, 265-338.]
- _____. *Arnautski pokret u XIX veku*, Beograd: Nova štamparija Davidović, 1905. [Васиљевић, Х. Ј.

- Арнаутски покрет у XIX веку*, Београд: Нова штампарија Давидовић 1905.]
_____. *Скопље и његова околина*, Београд: Штампарија "Sveti Sava", 1930. [Васиљевић, Х. Ј. *Скопље и његова околина*, Београд: Штампарија „Свети Сава“, 1930.]
Vukanović, Т. Р. „Arbanaški ustanci 1826-1832. godine“, *Vranjski glasnik*, 5, 1969, 27-66. [Вукановић, Т. П. „Арбанашки устанци 1826-1832. године“, *Врањски гласник*, 5, 1969, 27-66.]

СЛАВИША НЕДЕЉКОВИЋ

Универзитет у Београду, Филозофски факултет

ИЗМЕЂУ ЦАРСКИХ ВЛАСТИ И ОДМЕТНИКА (СТАРА СРБИЈА У ВРЕМЕ ПОБУНЕ СКАДАРСКОГ МУСТАФА-ПАШЕ БУШАТЛИЈЕ И БОСАНСКОГ БЕГОВАТА 1830-1832)

Резиме

Један од великих проблема са којим су турске централне власти морале да се носе после 1826. године било је питање односа са крупним феудалцима који су представљали носиоце политичке и економске власти у унутрашњости царства. Проблем се још више заострио када је Porta желећи да укине стари теократско-војнички систем и заведе савременији и либералнији режим дошла у перманентан сукоб са органима локалне управе у Румелијским пашалацима. Ово сукобљавање у оквиру муслиманског друштва разарало је јединство турско-исламске државе и било један од важних чиниоца у даљем слабљењу Османског царства. Борба са султаном и Портом била је предвођена најпре од скадарског Мустафа-паше а потом од босанског капетана Хусеина Градашчевића. Оба ова устанка прерасла су у велики војно-политички покрет чији је циљ био да се султан и Porta оружаним путем приморају на обустављање реформи и да дозволе повратак на старе обичаје и установе какве је прописивао шеријат. Период од 1829. до 1832. године донео је демографско и финансијско пропадање српском становништву у Старој Србији. У оба ова покрета, у сукобима албанских и босанских феудалаца са султаном, Србија је била бојно поље на коме су се директно сукобљавала два зарађена табора. Све ово је додатно оптеретило већ тежак положај српског народа у Старој Србији и довело је у питање његов опстанак у овој вековној српској земљи.

Кључне речи: Стара Србија, реформе, турске власти, Мустафа-паша, босански беговат, Османско царство.